

DECISION RECORD
and
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
for
CAMPBELL TRACT FACILITY MASTER PLAN

I. Decision:

It is my decision to implement a master plan for future development of the Campbell Tract Facility (CTF) utilizing the Meadows Site Plan. The mitigation contained as part of the Proposed Action and the mitigation measures attached to this document are included as part of my decision. A mitigation plan will be developed combining all mitigation measures into one concise document.

It is also my decision to select the Concept A entrance road alignment if the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is required to move the entrance road for public safety reasons. The road realignment will not be implemented unless directed by municipal or state agencies. The wetland mitigation included in the attached mitigation measures are part of my decision.

II. Rationale for the Decision:

The Campbell Tract (CT) is within the geographic boundary of the Alaska Southcentral Planning Area Management Framework Plan (MFP), dated March 1980. Although the subject of the administrative area facilities was not specifically addressed in the MFP, the Proposed Action is consistent with the rationale in Lands Activity Objective L-1.1, “When the use of the land is in the public interest, the Bureau should retain ownership.”

In reaching this decision, I carefully considered the analysis of impacts and the public comments for each of the site plan options. I also considered the requirements of Executive Order 1190 Protection of Wetlands. A summary of the rationale for selection of the master plan utilizing the Meadows Site Plan and rejection of the No Action, Gateway Site Plan and Courtyard Site Plan alternatives follows:

All development options utilize the same administrative building design. The main difference between alternatives is the location of the proposed administrative building and how other developments are phased or located.

Meadows Site Plan

The Meadows Site Plan allows for separation of the new building from the existing facility while maintaining ease of access for traveling between the buildings in the administrative complex. The site provides for a distinct public office building versus an industrial complex with a public office building. The separation improves public safety by concentrating public use in a safe area away from the helipads and industrial areas. It

also allows for increased security options including fencing of the warehouse and shop areas. The Meadows site provides the best aesthetic setting. Views of the mountains and exposure to sunlight are optimum. The siting in an undeveloped area allows helipads, other administrative buildings and the aircraft apron to remain in place. Although the footprint of the Meadows site is the largest, 17,000 square feet more than the Gateway site and 112,000 square feet more than the Courtyard site, all the potential sites are mitigated so there is no net loss of square footage of vegetation. The site best suits the programmatic needs of the BLM and provides better functionality for the employees, public and agency.

No Action Alternative

The No Action alternative was considered and rejected. The No Action Alternative would leave the facility in its present condition. Many of the buildings at the site are more than 39 years old and do not meet present seismic requirements, capacity or functional needs, and may not be cost effective to remodel or maintain. In order to meet current and future needs to help the BLM staff manage public lands across Alaska, the facility needs to be updated. The development and implementation of a master plan would assure the process is conducted in an efficient and cost effective manner.

Gateway Site Plan

The Gateway Site Plan has many of the same advantages as the Meadows site but is located well away from the existing facilities. It would be far less convenient for employees traveling between buildings in the administrative complex. The Gateway site concentrates traffic at the junction of the CCSC and entrance road reducing public safety. It also spreads the administrative complex over a larger area and would be more obvious to recreational users on the CT. The aesthetic setting is less desirable as is exposure to light because the site is closely surrounded by forest.

Courtyard Site Plan

The Courtyard Site Plan is the least desirable, primarily because it infringes upon the helipads and shop areas. It increases the complexity of phasing and would require relocation of some helipads. Overall, the functionality is less than the other sites. It provides lower public safety since it brings the public into the industrial portion of the CTF administrative complex.

Public comments received during scoping were generally in favor of the Meadows Site Plan option. Public interest in the proposed master plan development implementation was low in spite of several public announcements and solicitation of public comments through the media, public workshops and presentations. Most of the public indicated that they understood the need for keeping the facility updated and functional. There was one concern that the extension of utilities (water and sewer) would increase development in areas outside the CT. The BLM Alaska Resources Advisory Council (RAC), made up of a diverse cross section of interests, supported the implementation of a master plan.

Wetlands will be impacted only if the BLM is directed by an outside agency to realign the entrance road. In order to provide a complete analysis, the requirements of Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands, were considered for the federally owned wetlands along the portion of the alternate access road from Abbott Loop Road. On the selected and shortest route (Concept A), there are approximately 500 feet of federal wetlands (25,000 square feet) crossed from Abbott Loop Road to the intersection with the existing entrance road. In my consideration of Executive Order 11990 for federal lands, I found that there were no practicable alternatives for another entrance road alignment. The compensatory mitigation from rehabilitation of the sewage lagoons to wetland would rehabilitate an already disturbed wetland area back to a functioning status of near equivalent size. This and other mitigation measures include all practicable measures to minimize harm to federal wetlands.

The mission to manage public lands throughout Alaska remains as important today as it was 39 years ago when the BLM first moved to the CT. The mission to manage public lands in Alaska will continue into the foreseeable future. Implementation of a master plan to guide the development of administrative support facilities is critical to the BLM's mission in Alaska.

III. Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI):

Based upon the analysis of the potential environmental impacts, I have determined that the impacts are not expected to be significant and that an environmental impact statement is not required. The analysis has fully considered the developments proposed in the master plan implementation on the human environment and modified many of those actions to eliminate or mitigate impacts. The impacts from the developments proposed in the master plan utilizing the Meadows Site Plan are expected to be minor once mitigation measures have been implemented.

IV. ANILCA Section 810 Compliance:

The CT lands are Federal Public Land as defined in the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), Section 102 and fall under the authority of the Federal Subsistence Board and the Subsistence Regulations for the Harvest of Fish and Wildlife on Federal Public Lands in Alaska. The CT lies within the Anchorage Management Unit of Game Management Unit 14C which under the current Subsistence Regulations is closed to the taking of wildlife under both State (hunting and trapping) and Federal Subsistence Regulations. Further, the taking of wildlife on the CT is limited by Supplemental Rules issued on November 20, 1998 under 43 CFR 8365.1-6 that close the CT to the use of firearms, archery equipment, traps or snares. The CT has no documented consistent use by rural Alaskans of fish or game and no knowledge of such use has become available since the inception of the Federal Subsistence Program or the issuance of the above noted Supplementary Rules.

V. Adverse Energy Impact Compliance:

This action has been analyzed as required by Washington Office Instruction Memorandum 2002-053 to determine if it will cause an adverse impact on energy development. The action will not have an adverse direct or indirect impact on energy development, production or distribution. The preparation of a Statement of Adverse Energy Impact is not required.

/s/ June Bailey
Anchorage Field Manager

03-26-04
Date

Attachments:

1. Environmental Assessment (AK-040-04-EA-013) (48 pp.)
2. Mitigation Measures (3 pp.)